



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/703,351 | 10/31/2000 | Anders Borgstrom | 34650-604PT | 3222 |

23932 7590 05/19/2004

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, PC
1445 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 3200
DALLAS, TX 75202

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

LE, BRIAN Q

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2623

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/703,351

Applicant(s)

BORGSTROM ET AL.

Examiner

Brian Q. Le

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment and Arguments

1. Applicant's amendment filed March 15, 2004, has been entered and made of record.
2. Double-patenting rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 11-12, and 20 is withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments with regard to claims 1-32 have been fully considered, but are not considered persuasive because of the following reasons:

Applicant's arguments are directed toward various portions of Lazzouni cited by the Examiner. The Examiner points out that the rejections were based upon the entire reference. Therefore, Applicant is urged to consider the reference as a whole. When considering the cited portions within context the whole patent, it is seen that Lazzouni teaches the claimed invention.

In addition, the Applicant claimed limitations are very broad and is subjected to reasonable interpretation by one skilled in the art. For example, the Applicant argues (on page 5) that Lazzouni does not teach concept of configuration setting, namely, identifying a detected portion of an address pattern as being within an electronic reading device configuration area and converting position data received from a reading sensor into a configuration setting. The Applicant explained (on page 5) that configuration settings are URL or IP address for use, a time out setting, or any other setting for configuration information. Thus, it is clear that a configuration limitations setting can be broadly interpreted as the process of taking address pattern data and position data from the configuration pen, create an electronic representation of the data, store into host computers and **make use** of the information. Lazzouni clearly discloses this teaching at column 2, lines 40-67 and column 3, lines 1-35.

Regarding claim 6, the Applicant argues (bottom of page 5) that Lazzouni silent with respect to a configuration area and configuration setting. Once again due to very broadly

Art Unit: 2623

claimed languages, the Examiner indicated a reasonable interpretation and cited locations where Lazzouni teaches the claimed languages (Different coding algorithms and configuration areas show on Figures) (FIG. 4, FIG. 5A-D and column 3, lines 51-53).

Regarding claims 13 and 20, please refer back to the discussions above.

For claims 24-32, the Applicants argues that both Lazzouni and Bi do not teach the second processor for comparing the data entry to a stored user identifier and for enabling the electronic reading device if the data entry corresponds to the stored user identifier. Lazzouni discloses a system with multiple processors, a controller of the pen (column 8, lines 65-67) and the processor to control the host computer (column 9, lines 10-12). Lazzouni does not teach the processor for comparing the data entry to a stored user identifier and for enabling the electronic reading device if the data entry corresponds to the stored user identifier. As discussed in claims 13, 16 and 17 (see previous Office Action), Bi further teaches a pen-based computer system that uses a processor for comparing the data entry to a stored user identifier and for enabling the electronic reading device if the data entry corresponds to the stored user identifier (please refer back to claims 13, 16 and 17 for the teaching concepts). Modifying Lazzouni's method of electronic reading device according to Bi would be able to further increase the security protection by using password comparison configuration. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lazzouni according to Bi.

The Applicant also argues (on page 8) that Bi discloses comparing a password with a login password stored in a memory using a keyboard and not an electronic reading device by

Art Unit: 2623

translating detected portions of an address pattern into a data entry. Again, **an electronic reading device is so broad** that it can also be interpreted as the keyboard.

The Applicant believes that the claimed invention is unique and new over the prior arts. However, the Applicant must specifically/clearly claim the limitations to further distinguish the invention over the prior arts. Details regarding the claim language, is advised by the Examiner, need to be added to the claim to avoid broadly claimed language, which is open to subjective interpretation.

Thus, the rejections of all of the claims are maintained.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 21 is objected to because these claims are very difficult to understand due to the use of confusing language. **One skilled in the art does not understand the concept of “identifying a portion of the address pattern adjacent to the electronic reading device”, explanation is needed to further elaborate on how the address pattern can possibly adjacent to an apparatus/device.** Appropriate correction is required. The prior art rejection based on the Examiner’s best understanding. The Examiner clearly indicated of why the Examiner does not understand this concept (Previous Office Action and Current Office Action). The Examiner further requests the Applicant to provide further explanation of the claimed limitation.

Drawings

5. The drawing is of insufficient quality for publication (Note handwritten portions).

Art Unit: 2623

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-8, 13-15, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lazzouni U.S. Patent No. 5,652,412.

Regarding claim 1, Lazzouni teaches an electronic reading device (abstract), comprising:

A reading sensor for detecting a portion of an address pattern on a formatted surface (FIG. 9, element 204);

A processor (pre-processor/processor/microprocessor) (FIG. 11, element 264 and column 4, lines 30-40) for identifying the detected portion of the address pattern as being within an electronic reading device configuration area and for converting position data received from the reading sensor into a configuration setting (column 2, lines 60-67).

For claim 2, Lazzouni further teaches the electronic reading device wherein the electronic reading device configuration area comprises an electronic reading device configuration form (encoded paper) (FIG. 4 and column 3, lines 49-50).

Art Unit: 2623

Referring claim 3, Lazzouni also teaches the electronic reading device further comprising a memory for storing (storing unit) (column 3, lines 27-34) the configuration setting.

Regarding claim 4, Lazzouni teaches the electronic reading device wherein the processor converts the position data into the configuration setting using a configuration application (pen/stylus that reads and transfers the information) (column 4, lines 51-65).

For claim 5, Lazzouni discloses the electronic reading device wherein the position data corresponds to handwritten information written with the electronic reading device, the conversion of the position data into the configuration setting performed using handwriting recognition (column 5, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 6, Lazzouni teaches the electronic wherein the handwritten information is entered in field of the electronic reading device configuration area that corresponds to the configuration setting (FIG. 4 and FIG. 5A-D).

For claim 7, Lazzouni further discloses the electronic reading device wherein the position data is associated with at least one of a plurality of fields (FIG. 4 and FIG. 5A-D), the processor operating to convert a detection of a portion of the address pattern within the at least one of the fields into a configuration setting corresponding to the at least one field (column 9, lines 1-12 and column 4, lines 30-40).

Regarding claim 8, Lazzouni further teaches the electronic reading device wherein each of the plurality of fields corresponds to a different alphanumeric character (FIG. 1, element 12).

For claim 13, please refer back to claims 1 and 8 for the explanation.

For claim 14, please refer back to claim 7 and 8 for the explanation.

Art Unit: 2623

For claim 15, Lazzouni teaches the system further comprising a server for storing the at least one alphanumeric character (column 2, lines 40-67).

Referring to claim 20, please refer back to claim 1 for the explanation.

For claim 21, Lazzouni further teaches the method wherein the step of determining that the at least one detected position relates to an entry of configuration data comprises identifying a portion of the address pattern adjacent to the electronic reading device as corresponding to a configuration entry form (FIG. 4; FIG. 5A-5D and column 10, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 22, please refer back to claim 5 for the explanation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzouni U.S. Patent No. 5,652,412 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bi U.S. Patent No. 5,990,875.

Regarding claim 9, Lazzouni is not explicitly teaches an identification code. Bi teaches a pen-based computer system that utilizes identification code (password protection) (FIG. 40a). Modifying Lazzouni's method of electronic reading device according to Bi would able to provide the security to the configuration. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Lazzouni according to Bi.

Art Unit: 2623

For claim 10, Bi further teaches an address of a server (node address) used for authenticating configuration of the electronic reading device (FIG. 51, element 14002).

Referring to claim 11, Lazzouni teaches the transmitter for transmitting the configuration setting to a support server (host computer) (column 9, lines 15-27).

For claim 12, Lazzouni further teaches the electronic reading device wherein the transmitter transmits information via one of a cable (Ethernet) and a local wireless link (column 9, lines 15-27 and column 3, lines 5-8)

8. Claims 16-19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzouni U.S. Patent No. 5,652,412 as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Bi U.S. Patent No. 5,990,875.

Regarding claim 16, Lazzouni does not explicitly teach the comparing of alphanumeric character with a stored identification code. Bi teaches a pen-based computer system that compares alphanumeric character with a stored identification code (password matching) (FIG. 40a, elements 1312 and 1320). Modifying Lazzouni's method of electronic reading device according to Bi would be able to further increase the security protection by using password comparison configuration. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lazzouni according to Bi.

Regarding claim 17, Bi further teaches the use of the electronic reading device when the at least one alphanumeric character matches the stored identification code (FIG. 40a, elements 1320, 1322, and 1314).

Regarding claims 18-19, please refer back to claim 12 for the explanation.

Regarding claims 23, please refer back to claims 13, 16 and 17 for further explanation.

Art Unit: 2623

10. Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lazzouni U.S. Patent No. 5,652,412 and Bi U.S. Patent No. 5,990,875.

Regarding claim 24, Lazzouni teaches a electronic reading device comprising:

A formatted surface having an address pattern (FIG. 4 and FIG. 5A-5D), wherein a position relative to the address pattern can be determined from an examination of a portion of the address pattern (FIG. 9).

An electronic reading device including a reading sensor for detecting portions of the address pattern (column 2, lines 60-67); and

A first processor for translating detected portions of the address pattern into a data entry (column 4, lines 30-50).

Lazzouni does not teach the processor for comparing the data entry to a stored user identifier and for enabling the electronic reading device if the data entry corresponds to the stored user identifier. As discussed in claims 13, 16 and 17, Bi further teaches a pen-based computer system that uses a processor for comparing the data entry to a stored user identifier and for enabling the electronic reading device if the data entry corresponds to the stored user identifier (please refer back to claims 13, 16 and 17 for the teaching concepts). Modifying Lazzouni's method of electronic reading device with multiple processors according to Bi would be able to further increase the security protection by using password comparison configuration. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lazzouni according to Bi.

Regarding claim 25, Lazzouni uses the same processor to perform various means (column 3, lines 51-52). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the

Art Unit: 2623

first and the second processor to be the same processor to save cost and utilize the processor more efficiently.

Regarding claim 26, please refer back to claim 5 for the explanation.

For claim 27, Lazzouni further teaches the system wherein the data entry and the stored user identifier represent a handwritten signature (column 3, lines 26-34).

Regarding claim 28, please refer back to claim 9 for further explanation.

For claim 29, please refer back to claim 1 and claim 24 for the explanation.

For claim 30, please refer back to claim 5 for the explanation.

For claim 31, please refer back to claim 27 for the explanation.

For claim 32, please refer back to claim 28 for the explanation.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2623

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Q Le whose telephone number is 703-305-5083. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M - 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on 703-308-6604. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-5397 for regular communications and 703-308-5397 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

BL
May 4, 2004



**SAMIR AHMED
PRIMARY EXAMINER**